DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 893 TE 001 449

By-Lindsey, Alfred J.; Filson, Thomas

A Study Involving Development, Teaching, and Evaluation of the Results of a Course for Teachers Inservice Devoted to the Practical Application of Linguistics, of Principles of Composition, and of Various Approaches to the Teaching of the Slow Learner. Interim Report.

Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-5-0789

Pub Date Sep 68

Contract-OEC-5-10-029

Note-27p.

Available from-Alfred J. Lindsey, Jr., English Dept., Western Illinois University, Macomb, Ill. 61458, or Thomas Filson, Education Dept., University of Michigan, Flint, Michigan 48500 (free or on loan).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-•Applied Linguistics, •Composition (Literary), Effective Teaching, English Instruction, Extension Education, Inservice Courses, •Inservice Teacher Education, Linguistics, Secondary School Teachers, Self Evaluation, •Slow Learners, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Education, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Improvement, •Teacher Response, Teaching Methods

Identifiers-Project English

This study was made to discover whether or not teacher ideas and performance could be changed by a short English extension course on principles of composition, practical applications of linguistics, and various approaches to teaching slow learners. In 1965-66, three instructors spent 3 to 4 weeks in each of several schools in Illinois teaching their specialities to 66 junior and senior high school teachers. Before the extension course was taught, teachers completed questionnaires on their beliefs and teaching procedures. Each teacher was interviewed either 1 month or 12 months after completion of the course. The following data were gathered from the interviews: (1) 94% of the teachers claimed a change in teaching performance. (2) 61% claimed a change in thinking. (3) The kinds of changes reported by the teachers, who lacked consensus on the course's main ideas, did not coincide with the main ideas suggested by the instructors.(4) Very few teachers reported any constraints against utilizing the new ideas in their teaching situations. (5) Teachers interviewed after 1 month reported a 91% change in teacher performance: after 12 months they reported a 95% change. (6) An interviewer who was an instructor in the course found more change in teacher performance than did other interviewers. (Author/LH)

ED029893

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINION STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-20-1-65

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER
IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

A Study Involving Development, Teaching and Evaluation of the Results of a Course for Teachers Inservice Devoted to the Practical Application of Linguistics, of Principles of Composition, and of Various Approaches to the Teaching of the Slow Learner

Alfred J. Lindsey
and
Thomas Filson
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois

September, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

LE 001 247

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. Summary 1

B. Introduction 1

C. Method 3

II. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS 5

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 10

IV. SUPPLEMENTARY AND APPENDIX MATERIALS 13

A. References 13

B. Appendixes 14

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Summary

This study was made to discover whether or not teacher ideas and performance could be changed by a short English extension course in which the slow learner, composition, and linguistics were considered. Sixty-six junior and senior high school teachers participated. After the extension course was taught, interviewers were sent into the schools in which these teachers taught; each teacher was interviewed either about one month or about twelve months after completion of the course.

The interviews led to the following data:

(1) Ninety-four percent of the teachers claimed a change in teaching performance.
(2) Sixty-one percent of the teachers claimed a change in thinking.
(3) Because of the lack of consensus by the teachers on the main ideas of the course, the kinds of change did not closely juxtapose with the main ideas suggested by the instructors.
(4) Very few teachers reported any constraints against instituting the new ideas in their teaching situations.
(5) The interviews after one month suggested a ninety-one percent change in teacher performance; after twelve months there was a ninety-five percent change.
(6) An interviewer who was an instructor in the course found more change in teacher performance than did other interviewers.

The data, then, do suggest that the extension course planned for this study did bring about substantial change, both in teacher performance (94%) and in teacher thinking (61%). And since there is empirical evidence of the weakness in English teacher preparation and difficulty in getting new information in teaching English to English teachers, such courses could/should be planned and offered in various locations by all institutions of higher learning which are involved in the preparation of secondary English teachers.

B. Introduction

In this study, the English department of Western Illinois University planned a series of inservice courses which offered secondary English teachers pedagogical assistance in practical applications of linguistics, in principles of composition, and in various approaches to the teaching of the slow learner. Two primary questions eventuated from the planning of these

courses: First, would such courses change teacher thinking? Second, would such courses change teacher performance?

There are good reasons why such a study is needed: First, there is ample evidence, particularly in The National Interest and the Teaching of English,[1] that secondary English teachers are inadequately prepared, particularly in the areas of language and composition. In like manner, Squire and Applebee demonstrate that there is a very real weakness in programs of English for the slow learner.[2] Secondly, there is ample evidence in The National Interest and the Continuing Education of English Teachers[3] that secondary English teachers lack both preparation and confidence in the three areas mentioned above. Thirdly, The National Interest and the Continuing Education of English Teachers further demonstrates a profound weakness in programs of inservice education for practicing secondary English Teachers.

There is, then, dire need for making new information about teaching English available to practicing secondary English teachers as well as making available information that will fill holes in their preparation. There are, of course, agencies at work to help ameliorate the situation. There have been excellent institutes funded by various agencies, yet these reach only a small proportion of the secondary English teachers. Moreover, The English Journal, as well as other publications of The National Council of Teachers of English, offers help; but legions of English teachers do not belong to the National Council nor do they read its publications. Further, other attempts by universities and by school inservice programs reach only some of the secondary English teachers.

Ultimately, then, a plan is needed to reach more secondary English teachers with needed pedagogical information concerning the teaching of English. This supposition leads to vital questions: Can change in the secondary English curriculum be accomplished by less intensive and less expensive means than by procedures now being used? Indeed, how effective would brief extension courses offering important pedagogical information in English be in this regard?

Thus, this study was planned to examine these important questions. In this planning, the following hypotheses were formulated:

(1) Changes in classroom performance of the teachers involved in this study will be found.
(2) Teachers will demonstrate changed thinking about matters considered in the course.

(3) The changes found will be those associated with the parts of the course emphasized by the instructor.
(4) The teachers involved in the study will report numerous constraints against instituting the possible changes emanating from the course.
(5) There will be more change in teacher performance one month after the course than twelve months after the course.
(6) There will be more teacher change found by an interviewer who is a course instructor than by an interviewer who is a stranger to the teachers involved in the study.

C. Method

The extension course on which this study is predicated was offered in six geographic areas, all in Illinois: East Moline, Jacksonville, Quincy, Rock Island, Peoria, and Galesburg. The course was taught twice: in the Fall Quarter, 1965, and in the Winter Quarter, 1965-66. The course was taught first in Rock Island, Galesburg, and Quincy; then it was taught in East Moline, Peoria, and Jacksonville.

Each of the three instructors involved in teaching the course spent three or four weeks in each school, each instructor, then, teaching his speciality, composition, language, or the slow learner, to each of the teachers involved in the study. The following areas of English were considered in the course:

(1) practical applications of linguistics
(2) principles of composition
(3) various approaches to teaching the slow learner.

The objective in these three areas of the course are listed below:

(1) Composition
   a. To consider the importance of much writing.
   b. To consider the writing topics of interest to adolescents.
   c. To consider the importance of creative writing.
   d. To evaluate essays primarily according to unity and coherence.
   e. To evaluate progress in student writing.
   f. To use literature as a basis for the writing program.
   g. To consider how composition may be used in all school work.
(2) Linguistics
   a. To obtain an understanding of what constitutes the "new" descriptive attitude toward the English language, rather than the "old" prescriptive attitude.

b. To foster an attitude of investigating rather than of decreeing in the area of language.
c. To obtain a historical perspective of the English language, an appreciation of the fact that changes are still in progress; and to foster a sense of excitement about the present condition.
d. To create an awareness of the relationship of speech to writing, with its implications for the teaching of spelling and of beginning reading.
e. To evaluate the concept of the manipulation of language as exercise in its control.
f. To evaluate a "system" rather than a "parts" approach to the area of grammar.
g. To obtain a background of the history of grammar, incorporating the traditional, structural, and transformational approaches--with an attempt to formulate some kind of workable eclectic synthesis for use in the classrooms.
h. To understand the relationship of usage and grammar; to be aware of language areas that need to be included in a language course of study--lexicography, word formations, dialects, etc.

(3) Slow Learner
a. To study the needs and interests of slow learners.
b. To examine what various school systems are now doing for the slow learner.
c. To consider what vocations the slow learner can and will pursue in his life.
d. To consider pedagogical approaches that will allow the slow learner to succeed and to live with dignity.
e. To prepare professionally-set standards for the slow learner.
f. To consider the success of the oral approach.
g. To consider the need for sectioning.
h. To consider the value of a literature program built around the use of the newspaper.
i. To evaluate a simple transformational approach to sentence building for the slow learner.
j. To study how to build the writing program around letter writing.
k. To consider how to prepare a unit of work for the slow learner.

A total of sixty-six secondary and junior high school English teachers participated in the course. University credit was given by the English Department of Western Illinois University, and most of the teachers involved were apprised of the nature of the course by letter before they registered. Also, no indication was given that the course was part of a study of any kind. No hint that there would be any manner of follow-up of the course was given, either.

During the first meeting of the course, each participating teacher was asked to fill out a questionnaire concerning some of his beliefs and procedures. (See Appendix I) The beliefs and procedures measured were those that were to be considered in the course. The answers to the questionnaire were coded so that possible change in procedure and thinking could be measured.

After the courses were completed, the teachers involved were interviewed either about one month after the course or about twelve months after the completion of the course. The interviewers of the teachers were all professors at Western Illinois University; one of them was also an instructor in the course. For the group of teachers who took the course during the Fall Quarter, 1965, there were two interviewers, one being an instructor in the course. For the group who took the course during the Winter Quarter, 1965-66, there were ten interviewers from the English Department at Western Illinois University.

There were two structured forms used by the interviewers: First, there was an oral questionnaire to measure changes in attitudes, changes in teaching performance, understanding of main ideas in the course, use of linguistics, and resistance to new ideas by colleagues and administration. (See Appendix II) This interview was structured so that interviewers sought concrete examples of precisely what changes were appearing in the classrooms. Secondly, the interviewers were asked to fill out a form which concerned their reactions to the interview. (See Appendix III)

After these two questionnaires were returned by the interviewers, the investigators coded the responses. (See Appendix IV) Also, the coded result of each interview with each teacher is included. (See Appendix V)

II. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

An inspection of Table 1 reveals the principal findings of this study, as well as a major surprise. Indeed, ninety-four percent of the teachers demonstrated a change in teaching performance; but, surprisingly, the percentage of teachers who admitted to a change in thinking was considerably less: sixty-one percent.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS SHOWING CHANGE

	Group which took course Fall Term N 23	Group which took course Winter Term N 43	Total, both groups N 66
Changes in procedure			
No change	9%	5%	6%
Change	91%	95%	94%
Changes in thinking			
No change	39%	40%	39%
Change	61%	60%	61%

The exact changes in the teachers' pedagogical approaches are reported in Table 2.

TABLE 2

TYPES OF CHANGE IN TEACHING PROCEDURE

	Group which took course Fall Term	Group which took course Winter Term	Total, both groups
Linguistics			
Teach ideas learned	18	21	39
Adopt linguistics	4	7	11
Took more work in linguistics	1	3	4
Total No.	23	31	54
Slow Learner			
Use newspaper	4	16	20
Differentiated assignments	4	3	7
Oral composition work	3	2	5
Total No.	11	21	32
Composition			
Correcting by using overhead	0	5	5
Grade content	3	6	9
Change theme topics	2	4	6
More care in evaluation	4	7	11
Assign rewriting	0	2	2
Integrate with literature	1	2	3
More writing	2	4	6
Increased use of essay exams	3	0	3
Total No.	15	30	45
Grand total of all three areas	49	82	131

It is clear indeed that change in teacher performance was accomplished. There were fifty-four changes reported in linguistics, thirty-two changes reported in composition, and forty-five changes reported in teaching the slow learner, all of this totaling one hundred thirty-one changes in teacher performance. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that only twelve of the teachers reported restraint by environmental teaching situations.

Another important concern eventuates from the interviews: An instructor in the course, one who taught the segment concerning

the slow learner, did a portion of the interviewing. And the results are surprising, as evidenced in Table 3.

TABLE 3

TOTAL NUMBER OF CODED REPORTED CHANGES IN PERFORMANCE FOR THOSE WHO TOOK THE COURSE DURING THE WINTER TERM

	Slow Learner	Composition	Linguistics
Instructor As Interviewer	20	7	11
Stranger As Interviewer	4	9	13

Note that this instructor discovered twenty changes in the area that he taught, while the interviewer who was a stranger found only four changes.

The teachers involved in the study were also asked to identify the principal ideas for each portion of the course. (See Appendix IV) Here there was much confusion. As a matter of fact, it would be difficult to guess that the teachers had taken the same course. At most, there was a one-fourth agreement on what was the main idea. Hence, many types of teacher changes were to be expected. This was exactly the situation, particularly in the composition segment of the course in which there was the least amount of agreement as to the main ideas of the course.

Ultimately, then, the various hypotheses have been answered. The first two hypotheses of the study were supported, for there was change in both teacher performance and thinking; sixty-one percent of the teachers claimed a change in thinking, while ninety-four percent demonstrated a change in teaching performance. The third hypothesis, that the pedagogical changes would be in the direction of the parts of the course emphasized, was refuted because of the lack of consensus by the teachers concerning precisely what the emphasized parts of the course were. The fourth hypothesis, which suggested that the teachers would report many constraints against instituting the possible changes emanating from the course, was not supported. Indeed, few teachers reported constraints of

any type. Hypothesis five, which predicted more change in one month than in twelve months, was disproved; there was slightly more change after twelve months (95%) than after one month (91%). The final hypothesis suggested that there would be more teacher change found by an interviewer who was a course instructor than by an interviewer who was a stranger to the teachers involved in the study. This hypothesis was certainly supported; the instructor-interviewer found five times as many changes for his segment of the course.

One important question posed by this study has been answered; yes, teacher change and performance can be achieved by a relatively inexpensive extension course. The data do reveal that most of the teachers who took the course did change, these changes being verified in the field by interviewers who examined various kinds of evidence, including assignments, papers, questions, and tests used by the teachers. Moreover, the interviewers were asked to evaluate the interview (See Appendix 3), an endeavor which led to the following tabulation. In all but three cases the interviewers felt that the teachers were leveling with them; thirty-seven of the teachers led the interviewers to feel that they were either very favorable or somewhat favorable to the course. Ten of the teachers were seen as reacting either not favorably or negatively, and in only six cases did the interviewers feel any defensiveness to the interview. Most important, however, was the fact that thirty-nine of the teachers voluntarily backed their claims of change by citing specific examples and instances of what they were doing in the classroom.

Another important matter needs to be considered: The <u>amount</u> of change was not the business of this study. Rather, the concern was to get firm measures of change due to the extension course. Obviously, then, an important question remains: What would be the relative amounts of change produced by an extension course like the one planned for this study as compared with the change produced by more extensive, expensive institutes?

The data of this study, however, do reveal that without a doubt most of the teachers involved in this study did teach differently because of the course. But how is this finding to be regarded? Will all English teachers begin using new ideas because they have had three or four three-hour sessions in an extension course? Moreover, will all extension courses which are aimed at changing teacher performance do so? Indeed, how far can the results be generalized?

It is important to remember that the teachers who took part in this study were self-selected. Thus, it is not judicious

to submit that all teachers would change if exposed to such a course; perhaps teachers who are willing to take an extension course are more apt to change performance than those who are not willing to take such a course. An example suffices to demonstrate this point. One of the areas of concern in the extension course was linguistics, a fact that was publicized by the extension office and by a letter from the English Department at Western. No doubt many teachers who were biased against the term linguistics simply refused to participate. Similarly, those who were excited about linguistics perhaps chose to take the course. Hence, care must be exercised in generalizing the results of this study to all secondary English teachers.

On the other hand, there is ample reason to indicate that the teachers involved in this study were a representative group of secondary and junior high English teachers. The instructors believed that this was so, and there was a good sampling of teachers from various teaching situations, both large and small, wealthy and poor.

Another problem concerning the interviewing needs to be considered. Why did the interviewer who was a teacher in the extension course find much more evidence of change in his area of the course than other interviewers did? The changes listed by this interviewer were substantiated; he did get evidence that the changes occurred. Thus, it is highly unlikely that the changes were fictional. But why did the instructor-interviewer find so much change in his area of the course? The answer may well be that many teachers did not associate changes with the course, even though these changes grew out of the course. The interviewer who taught the course was knowledgeable enough to furnish cues that the naive interviewers could not do. Interestingly, this leads to an important conjecture that the data reported in this study is actually an underestimate of the teacher change examined in this study.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The obvious conclusion is that extension courses are important agencies in re-education of practicing English teachers. It has been demonstrated that nearly all of the teachers changed their teaching performance due to one or more of the areas studied in the extension course. Further, teacher thinking was changed in substantial numbers. The extension course examined in this study did have a powerful influence on both teacher performance and teacher thinking.

In the introduction of this paper, the dire need for re-education of secondary English teachers was analyzed. There

is ample proof of the weakness of secondary English teacher preparation and of the weaknesses in getting new pedagogical information to practicing English teachers. There is also empirical evidence of the body of information that these teachers need to update themselves and to fill holes in their preparation.

Ultimately, then, there is a clear mandate to the colleges and universities to update and re-educate the English teachers that they have trained. Indeed, there are moral and professional obligations for the institutions of higher learning to do so. And they must further understand that they are not educating literature majors to teach literature majors in the public schools. The colleges and universities must, then, plan extension courses to service their graduates as well as other secondary English teachers. Further, these institutions must plan the extension courses in practical fashion, basing them on solving weaknesses in teacher preparation and in making new information in teaching English available. Such information should include the following: linguistics, composition, adolescent literature, reading, oral interpretation, and other empirically demonstrated teacher needs. The institutions of higher learning must take such extension courses into the field in many locations each year. These institutions must express interest in the plight of the teachers in the public schools. And all of this is an absolute necessity in Illinois, a state in which nearly half of the secondary English teachers do not hold a major in their teaching area.

Also, part of the problem could be solved by better preparation of English majors in their undergraduate training. If this were done, the extension courses could turn attention to new information in teaching English. The departments of English must descend from their medieval ivory towers, and they must look away from their tragic preoccupation with formalism in training secondary English teachers. They must agree that they are educating their students to teach adolescents English. In this regard, there must be training not only in classical literature but also in composition, language, reading, grammars, and adolescent psychology. Too long have the institutions of higher learning assumed that they are training literature majors. That is only part of their obligation, and their adhering to this ancient supposition leads to the compounding of the problems of those they claim to be preparing for a career of teaching secondary English. Indeed, there is a clear, empirical mandate for the kind of program needed to prepare secondary English teachers. An excellent source on which to base such a university program is found in the ISCPET "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement" list.[4]

Another serious problem exists, however. Unfortunately, there is evidence that legions of public school English teachers will not take advantage of opportunities to take extension courses in English. For this reason, there must be incentives for them. And in this regard, there are two primary areas of help: the local school district and governmental funding agencies. The local school districts must make it economically profitable for the teachers to continue their education. Certainly the school district should pay tuitions involved, provide released time, and, if possible, provide sabbatical leaves. Moreover, salary increments should be provided for additional work in English. The governmental funding agencies can also help; for instance, the U. S. Office of Education might well experiment with inservice extension courses. Experiments might well be carried out that would pay both the university and its teachers as well as the public school teachers who take the course. Then there should be a study of change because of such a course as compared with change because of much more expensive NDEA summer institutes. How many more teachers might be reached with a given sum of money?

Thus, there is a triad of hope in the re-education of secondary English teachers. First, there is the work of the universities and colleges in preparing and offering practical, usable extension courses in teaching English. Secondly, there is work of the local school district encouraging the secondary English teachers to enroll in such courses. Finally, there is the need for funding agencies, like the U. S. Office of Education, to cast support to such extension courses.

IV. SUPPLEMENTARY AND APPENDIX MATERIALS

A. References

[1]*The National Interest and the Teaching of English*. NCTE: Champaign, 1961.

[2]Applebee, Roger and James Squire. *A Study of English Programs in Selected High Schools Which Consistently Educate Outstanding Students in English*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois. Cooperative Research Project Number 1994. 1966.

[3]*The National Interest and the Continuing Education of English Teachers*. NCTE: Champaign, 1964.

[4]"Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement." ISCPET: Urbana, 1965.

B. Appendixes

APPENDIX I

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____

List below the classes you teach. Indicate for each the grade level, and if sectioned the section level.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Check the frequency you use the following in your classes.

New World Dictionary
Standard Dictionary
Merriam Webster Dictionary
Merriam Webster's 7th
American College Dictionary
Oxford Dictionary
Fowler's Modern English Usage
Margaret Bryant's Current American Usage
Bergen Evans Dictionary of Contemporary Usage
Harwood Dictionary of American English Usage
Nicholson American English Usage

How frequently do you have your students do the following?

Build original sentences
Parse or diagram sentences
Expand, transform, or substitute sentence elements

Check your method of arbitrating questions of language usage.

Encourage students to make observations about language usage.
Refer them to established authorities.
Use a combination of the above.

Check the phrase that best describes your basic textual material.

Traditionally oriented.
Traditionally oriented, modified and augmented by linguistic findings.
Structurally oriented.

If you were free to choose anew, which would you choose?

How often do you have students work exercises where they must apply rules?

Do you include a history of the English language anywhere in your own English teaching?

What units about the nature of the English language do you teach as a regular part of your instruction?

Do you feel students might well take Latin so they may better master their own language?

How would you teach slow learners how to diagram predicate nouns?

What grammar text and what literature text do you use with slow learners?

Do you use newspapers as text books for slow learners?

If you were to teach slow learners spelling rules, how would you teach them the "ie, ei" rule?

In a sentence or two tell why you do or do not believe in sectioning for the slow learners.

What procedure are you using with slow learners that you are not using with other students?

If you would use the play <u>Julius Caesar</u> in a class of slow learners, how would you motivate the students to really enjoy it?

By what means do you determine in advance of making a composition assignment, what criteria you will use in judging student writing?

To what extent do your composition assignments require the students to go beyond narrative, simple description, and reporting of information.

How much emphasis do you place upon organization, development, communication of thought, and style of writing in proportion to the emphasis given to correctness, mechanics, and form?

How can teachers make themselves fully aware of the problems students are likely to encounter in completing each composition?

What method or methods do you use to induce your students to revise their compositions, correct their own errors, rethink and rewrite?

By what techniques can students be encouraged to express ideas creatively?

Should a single theme topic be required of all students on a given composition assignment?

APPENDIX II

ORAL QUESTIONNAIRE

#_____

What are you now doing in your class that is different because of the course? (Each noted below should be in action terms; seek confirmation if in doubt.)

What changes have occurred in your thinking, but not in action, as a result of the course?

What was the main idea that each of the three instructors was trying to get across?

If the teacher has not indicated the following ask specifically: What is the immediate use of the linguistics approach?

What resistance do you run up against from colleagues and administration in trying to implement what you learned about the slow learner?

APPENDIX III

REACTION TO INTERVIEW

Teacher_____Code_____City_____

How did you feel about whether the teacher was leveling with you?

Did you pick up any feeling either pro or con the course experiences?

What was the teacher's reaction to giving the questionnaire?

Did the teacher voluntarily offer to back up assertions to question number one by showing student work or other materials?

What was the teacher's reaction to the whole process of being interviewed?

Is the teacher going to move to another position next fall? Where

APPENDIX IV

CODED INTERVIEW RESPONSES: GROUP A

Teacher	Do Differently			Ideas Changed			Main Ideas of Course			Restraints	Interviewer Comments			
	Linguistics	Composition	Slow Learner	Linguistics	Composition	Slow Learner	Linguistics	Composition	Slow Learner		Level With You	Attitude Toward Course	Interview Back Up Claims	Reaction to
1	2,4	16,6	4,10			3	6	6	1	-,2,9	1	1	3	1
2				1			6	2	1		1	2	3	1
3	2,3						6	1	1		1	3	3	8
4		11		2			6	1	2		1	2	3	1
5	23	4					6	1	2		1	2	3	1
6	23	13		1			6	9	7	-9	1	2	3	5
7	2,3	6		1			6	1	7	-9	1	3	3	8
8	2		9				6	14	1		1	1	3	1
9		5				3					1	1	3	1
10		6					3				1	3		5
11	2	5	3								1	1	2	1
12	2										1	2	1	1
13	2	15	10,9			4,3,5	5	4	2	-				
14	9				4	1	10	10	3	+				
15							5		2					
16	2		4,11	1		1,3	11		2	-				
17		15	10,3,6	1			11	1	2					
18	2	10	6,12				12	1	5	-				
19	2		9,13,10	1,5		5	5	6	8	-				
20	2	11	14				13	1	8	+				
21	2,7		3,4,11	1			2	2	2	-				
22	2	6,15	6,10	1		4	6	6	8	+,2,7				
23	2			1			14		3					

GROUP B

Teacher	Do Differently			Ideas Changed			Main Ideas of Course			Restraints	Interviewer Comments			
	Linguistics	Composition	Slow Learner	Linguistics	Composition	Slow Learner	Linguistics	Composition	Slow Learner		Level With You	Attitude Toward Course	Back Up Claims	Reaction to Interview
1	1	1,2		01			1,2	-	1,2	+123	1,2	3	1	6,5
2		3					01				1	5	3	1
3	01				2		01			+2,3	2	3	3	7
4		4	1			1		1	1	1,4	1	2	3	3
5		5,9						2	1		3	6	3	8
6	2,3,4		2		2,5		2,3	1,3	3,2	-	1	1	3	5, 1
7	2	2,4					4		1	2,5	1	6	1	1
8	2,5		3	01			4	1	3		1	74	3	1
9	2		3	01			5	1	3		1	1		3
10	2		3	01		2	5	1	4	-	1	1	3	1
11	4	4	3		2		4	1	3	+	1	1		1
12	5	5,6				01	4	5	1	-6	1	2	3	3
13	2,3	6	3				4	4	1	-	1	1	3	1
14	2	4,6,7	3	1			5	6	3	-	1	1	1	1
15		3,6	4			3	6	7	5	-7	1	1	3	1
16		8	4,5	1	3			6		-	1	1	3	1
17	01			1			6	6	3	-	1	2	3	1
18		6	3	1		1	6	6	5	-	1	1	3	1
19	2		3				7	6	3	-	1	1	2	1
20	2	5					7		3	-	1	2	1	1
21	2	5								-	2	3	3	1
22	2,3,4	9	3				7	4	3	-	1	1	1	1
23	6		3							+4	1	1	3	1
24			3,6,7							-				
25	2	10				1	5	5	1	-				
26			6			2								
27	2					1								
28						1								
29	2					2,3	6	6	2	-8	1	1	3	1
30		3	3			1	5	8	1	-	1	1	2	1
31	3	11,3	8				8	8	1	-	1	1	2	1
32			9			1				-	2	2	3	3
33	2		3				6	6	6	-	1	2	1	1
34		3									1	2L	3	1
35	2,5	6	4,9							-				
36	7,02									-	1	1	3	1
37						3	7	6	1	-	1	2	3	2
38	2		3							-	1	1	1	1
39	3,2,5	11					9	6	1	-	1	1	1	1
40	5		3	2			9	4	2	+	1	1	1	1
41	2,3	6,11	3	2			6	1	2	-	1	1	3	1
42	2,3	4							1	-	1	2	3	1
43	2	4,7,8,11		2		3	6	1	3	-	2	2	3	2

APPENDIX V

INTERVIEW CODES

I. D Differently

A. Linguistics

1. Use in prompting speech class
2. Teach linguistic ideas
3. Adopt linguistic text
4. Take other courses in linguistics
5. Read more about linguistics
6. Lobby for curricular change
7. Have non prescriptive attitudes

B. Composition

1. Use reading list
2. Use oral sheet
3. Use overhead projector for themes
4. Grade concepts not mechanical errors
5. Plan more interesting theme topics
6. Use more care in evaluation of compositions
7. Do more work in rewriting
8. Integrate writing with literature
9. Evaluate one thing at a time in a composition
10. Assign for particular thing to be learned
11. Write more often
12. Emphasize creativity
13. Use separate grades
14. Grade student progress
15. Consider how to answer essay exams
16. Go outside of text for materials

C. Slow Learner

1. Be mechanical
2. Get separate classes for them
3. Use newspaper as text
4. Plan differentiated assignments
5. Use projects developed in class
6. Build around oral composition
7. Plan vocabulary word lists from student errors
8. Use suggested outline
9. Take time with students
10. Grade more easily
11. Teach what they enjoy
12. Teach them to follow directions
13. Include no grammar

II. Ideas Changed

A. Linguistics

1. Look for new ideas in journals
2. More tolerant
3. Help in spelling
4. Get rid of tests
5. Plan correlation of grammar and composition

B. Composition

1. Should use evaluation sheet
2. Emphasize syntax
3. Want to develop intensive writing center
4. Include more writing

C. Slow Learner

1. Should work more with them
2. Identify them to help them
3. Have differentiated expectation
4. Consider wants of group
5. Get rid of texts

D. Not Specific to one section of course

01. Many changes
02. Some changes
03. Few changes
04. No changes

III. Main Ideas of Course

A. Linguistics

1. Covered too much
2. Linguistics is an attitude
3. Students can learn it
4. Try it
5. Should replace it
6. You should read more
7. Importance of sentence patterns
8. Different concept of teaching
9. Get more meaning in grammar
10. Use various grammars
11. Consider language changes
12. English is not Latin
13. Importance of induction approach
14. Possible to teach composition structures

B. Composition

1. Structure, not mechanics most important
2. Writing essential
3. Assignments must be well planned
4. Evaluate one thing at a time
5. Make meaningful
6. Think out criteria for each
7. Write, not workbook
8. Students do the evaluating
9. Group students
10. Effect of positive comments on paper

C. Slow Learner

1. Responsibility
2. Regular curriculum won't work, need functional curriculm
3. Newspapers and materials
4. Identify
5. Use different approach
6. Make things simple
7. Must separate
8. Teach at his level

IV. Restraints

1. Text no help
2. Principal won't allow
3. No tracking in this school
4. Department head won't cooperate
5. Has track but not doing job
6. Use of newspaper welcomed
7. Comments from fellow teachers
8. Bored of text and syllabus
9. Parents won't cooperate

V. Interviewer Comments

A. Level With You

1. Yes
2. Yes, with qualification
3. I am suspicious
4. No

B. Attitude Toward Course

1. Pro
2. Somewhat pro

3. Not ver pro
4. Con
5. Busy work
6. Too much work linguistics section
7. Got no help in grading

C. Back Up Claims

1. Yes
2. Somewhat
3. No

D. Reaction to Interview

1. Enjoyment
2. Pleasant
3. Neutral, or couldn't tell
4. Somewhat, no guard
5. Defensive
6. He didn't like me
7. Get it over with
8. Ill at ease